



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,392	05/24/2001	Patricia Diana Griffin	AUS920010100US1	1189
7590	12/10/2004		EXAMINER	
Joseph R. Burwell Law Office of Joseph R. Burwell P.O. Box 28022 Austin, TX 78755-8022			HEWITT II, CALVIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/864,392	GRIFFIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Calvin L Hewitt II	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-30 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant is of the opinion that the prior art of Bapat et al. do not teach the Applicant's system. Specifically, Applicant asserts that the prior art of Bapat et al. fails to teach: a role filter, associating abilities with a role, a capability filter, authorizing access to a protected resource based on a requestor's role. The Applicant admits that the prior art of Bapat et al. teaches access-control based management (Response to Office Action, 8-23-04, page 4). Therefore, in order for Bapat et al. to read on Applicant's claims, the prior art need only utilize "roles" to determine access control to protected resources. Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary defines a "role" as "an identifier attached to an index term to show functional relationship between terms". Hence, Bapat et al. teach "roles" as a user can be a member of a group (column/line 9/45-10/15), the group being a representation of a role, or roles, of the user in an organization, or at least within the DBMS (abstract). Bapat et al. teach a "role filter" as the system uses the group name, or role, to filter out users who do not have access to an object (abstract; figures 5 and 6). Each group, or role, has capabilities (figure 4) and

Art Unit: 3621

access is determined based on whether the user has membership in a particular group and said group has access to the object (abstract; figures 4-6; column 10, lines 35-48). Finally, by Applicant's own admission the exact processes that the Applicant is attempting to claim is old and well-known (Response to Office Action, 8-23-04, page 4). Therefore, even if Bapat et al. were not to teach Applicant's system the claims would be rejectable under 102 in view of Applicant's own admitted prior art.

Claims 6-10, 16-20, and 26-30 recite conditional language. More specifically, these claims fail to consider how the system is to perform if the condition does not hold. Conditional statements necessarily include two embodiments the "if" case and the "if not" case. Hence, giving claims they're broadest reasonable interpretation, the prior art need only teach the "if not" case in order to read on the claim. For example, claim 8 recites selecting from the group comprising "principal", "resource", "capability" or "role". Hence, if the selection is, say, "role", then claim 9 doesn't occur. Or, if the selection is "resource" neither claim 9 or 10 occur.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patently distinguishes them from the references.

Examiner maintains the rejection to claims 1-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bapat et al., U.S. Patent 6,038,563.

As per claims 1, 11 and 21, Bapat et al. teach a method for controlling access rights of a requesting principal to a protected resource in a computer system comprising:

- associating a role filter with a role (column/line 9/45-10/15)
- associating a set of one or more capabilities with the role (figure 4)
- associating a capability filter with a capability in the set of one or more capabilities (abstract; column/line 9/45-10/15)
- authorizing access for the requesting principal to the protected resource based on an association between the requesting principal and the role and based on an association between the protected

resource and a capability of the role (abstract; figures 4-6; column 10, lines 35-48)

As per claims 2-5, 12-15 and 22-25, Bapat et al. teach creating a database (DBMS) (e.g. hence data can be sorted, filtered, instantiated, searched, etc.) associates a user or principal with a group (role), assigns the group rights such as what resources the group and hence the user has access to. Further, as Bapat et al. implement their system using a DBMS to determine the access rights of a user who's trying to access a protected resource Bapat et al. clearly anticipate claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 26, and 27, as those claims merely describe the how a DBMS performs in response to a request from a user. Regarding claims 8-10, 18-20, and 28-30, Bapat et al. teach updating the database (figure 16D). In addition, Bapat et al. teach a user attempting to access a protected resource (abstract). Thus, in order to determine if the user is eligible to access said resource the system collates the user's group and access rights (e.g. capabilities) hence Bapat et al. teach the "determining", "searching" and "running" steps of claims 8, 18, and 28, and the filtering of claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29 and 30.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Calvin Loyd Hewitt II whose telephone number is (703) 308-8057. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
c/o Technology Center 2100
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 (for formal communications intended for entry and after-final communications),

or:

(703) 746-5532 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5,
2451 Crystal Drive, 7th Floor Receptionist.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Calvin Loyd Hewitt II

December 2, 2004

JAMES P. TIGHE, III
SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Washington, D.C. 20591